DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 023 SP 006 071

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Evaluation of Training Program for Community College Educators of Academically Deprived Students. |
| INSTITUTION | Hawaii Univ., Honolulu. School of Social Work. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Bureau of Higher Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Coll. Support. |
| PUB DATE | [70] |
| NOTE | 65p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Academic Achievement; *Community Colleges; *Poverty Programs; Program Descriptions; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Programs; Teaching Experience |

ABSTRACT

This training program was designed to provide community college educators with a deeper understanding of the nature of poverty and the manner in which poverty and deprivation affect the students' ability to learn in the formal educational system. The program was divided into three basic segments. The first two segments, conducted during the first 2 weeks of the program, were classroom seminars. One section was devoted to deprivation and its effect on learning, and the second section was devoted to learning and teaching theory. The third segment was conducted during the third week of the program and involved an actual teaching situation in which trainees were divided into eight groups with three to five trainees in each group. Each group presented one lesson for the other trainees to observe and evaluate. The teaching presentation was offered primarily to community college and college students. (Conclusions based on partially completed program evaluation are included. Appendixes contain related program material.) (Author/MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

University of Hawaii - Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

ED 074023

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# Training Program for Community College Educators of Academically Deprived Students #70-2829

Director's Name: Sidney M. Rosen
Address: 1395 Lower Campus Road
Telephone Number: 944-7182

The program was the prime responsibility of the School of Social Work in cooperation with the community college system.
The program began on July 27, 1970, and concluded on August 14, 1970.

SP 006 071

# EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATORS OF ACADEMICALLY DEPRIVED STUDENTS

Submitted by Sidney M. Rosen, Project Director

This training program was intended primarily for community college teachers in the State of Hawaii. It was expected that the greater number of trainees would come from the island of Oahu, representing Leeward, Honolulu and Kapiolani Community Colleges, with some trainees coming from Kauai, Maui and Hawaii. After applications began to come in for the program, some thought was given to admitting a few educators from the mainland who had indicated an interest in attending. The feeling was that a broader view of the problems of deprived students throughout the United States would add spice to the entire program. Since Hawaii is rather removed from the mainland, it was also felt that this would reduce the provincialism of the training program and help to provide some insights into experiences that mainland community college teachers and some university teachers were having ~~in-experiences~~ with the deprived student. Although we had originally intended to have only thirty trainees in the program, a large applicant response motivated us to request of the Office of Education that the enrollment figure be extended from thirty to forty. This request was subsequently granted and our final enrollment figure was thirty-seven. Of the thirty-seven trainees who did attend the program, six were from the mainland, three from the neighbor islands and the remainder, twenty-eight, were from the island of Oahu. The breakdown on

participation from the Oahu Community Colleges is as follows: Leeward - 10, Kapiolani - 10, and Honolulu - 6. The Participant Selection Committee consisted of Edith Doi, Community College Coordinator of Institutional Research; Walter Chun, Coordinator of Community Services; and Sidney M. Rosen, Project Director.

The program was conducted through the facilities of Honolulu Community College. These facilities were arranged for the program by the Assistant Director, who was actually our community college appointed liaison, Dr. Edith Doi. After the initial arrangements for space were made by Dr. Doi, the Project Director met with the Honolulu Community College administration to refine the arrangements, indicating the exact kind of space and other facilities that would be needed in order for the program to be carried out. This included arrangements for two classrooms, video-tape equipment, and additional facilities that were from time to time required. The other major facility in addition to the classrooms that was used during the training program was the Community College cafeteria.

The School of Social Work cooperated with the training program by providing three hours of graduate credit for all trainees who desired credit. Twenty-nine trainees took advantage of the opportunity to earn graduate credit. The course number assigned to the training program was Social Work 630.

The primary purpose of the training program was to provide community college educators with a deeper understanding of the

nature of poverty and the manner in which poverty and deprivation affect the student's ability to learn in the formal educational system. The need for this kind of program was brought about through the adoption by the University of Hawaii of an open-door policy for its community colleges. Currently, students need not have a high-school diploma to attend a community college. This poses the problem for the community colleges of attempting to prcvide a meaningful education for people who have had histories of academic failures and whose environmental conditioning does not provide training for structured learning. In setting up the program it was felt that in order for teachers to learn to teach the deprived student better, they first had to have an understanding of the problems that minority groups and the poor, generally, bring to school with them and that cause them to have difficulty in achieving academic success. Because the student is not equipped to handle the school situation and because the school and teachers are frequently not able to adjust their structure and techniques to the problems of the poor student (both poor money-wise and poor in academic functioning) the experience becomes a frustrating one for the student, who finds his expectation for failure realized, and equally frustrating for the teacher, who often feels that the student does not want to learn and cannot learn and therefore is taking up time and effort that could be used by others who are more motivated.

In order to equip the teacher with a better understanding of poverty, and also to help him better understand the way he teaches and the way people respond to his teaching, the program was divided into three basic segments. The first two segments were conducted during the first two weeks of the program. They consisted of two sections of classroom seminars. One section was devoted to "Deprivation and Its Effect on Learning" and the second section was devoted to "Learning and Teaching Theory". The third segment was conducted during the third week of the program and involved an actual teaching situation where the trainees were divided into eight groups with three to five trainees in each group. Each group presented one lesson for the other trainees to observe and to evaluate. The teaching presentation was presented to community college and college students primarily. The students were hired at $3.00 an hour with the title "student consultants". There were also four young girls of high school age who attended the program as a result of some groudwork that was done in a public housing project. Although the girls were younger than what was desired, the director felt impelled to take them because of the source from which they were referred. The intent was to have all community college students in the teaching laboratory. However, many students who were arranged for by Kapiolani Community College and Honolulu Community College for participation in the laboratories did not, at the last minute, come through for us. The major reasons for their failure to follow through on their

original commitments were: 1) They had found other jobs, and 2) those who were referred through Job Upgrading had scheduling conflicts. Other students had no understandable reason for their failure to participate. University students were used to fill the last minute openings. The student consultants served as both students and evaluators for the laboratory.

According to the trainees, the value of the laboratory sessions was imparied because of the composition of the class. Some of the trainees felt that ~~all~~ only deprived community college students should have been used. The director felt also that this would have better met the goal of the laboratory; however, the obstacle of last minute dropouts resulted in adjustments having to be made. Another thing we found was that the community college students who did participate tended not to be articulate. The critiquing was done mostly by the University students.

The greatest values of the laboratory were: 1) exposing the teachers to examples of good teaching, 2) giving them the opportunity, albeit under stressful condition, to carefully develop a lesson that was aimed at motivating people to become interested and to learn, and 3) appreciating the value of television as a teaching tool. There is already evidence that trainees who heretofore had not used the television equipment at Honolulu Community College are now doing so. This has been reported to us by the audio-visual director, who said that use of this equipment in previous years has been almost non-existent. The program has also motivated the purchase of new equipment.

Some things that were learned from the laboratory experience were:

1. Oral critiques inhibited both students and trainees from reacting to the teaching situations. The more vocal people carried the ball and others allowed the inertia of non-involvement to dull their participation. Critiques in the future should therefore be written within the confines of a closed ended questionnaire with opportunities for additional comments provided. Discussion can then follow based on the responses.

2. Television did not provide the best opportunity for observation because of the small screen size and the sometimes inaudible remarks made by both teachers and students. More sensitive equipment is now under consideration for purchase by the Honolulu Community College audio-visual director.

3. Teachers sometimes did not participate actively in the teaching presentations. Some trainees allowed the bulk of the work to be done by others. Fortunately this behavior was limited and serious uninvolvement occurred in only one group.

4. Trainees sometimes had difficulty relating classroom learning material and field visits to the demonstration teaching laboratory. This phenomenon has also been observed in the School of Social Work where assimilation

of classroom instruction with field work experience often takes a great deal of time. The follow-up evaluation in December and April should help in determining whether the classroom and experiential inputs had greater meaning once the teachers were back in teaching experiences and had time to reflect on what they had learned from the training program.

The outline of the program was presented and discussed by the training program faculty well in advance of the program and met with their approval. However, the two psychology professors expressed their feelings that the program ought to be almost exclusively learning theory since knowledge gained in this area could be objectively evaluated, while the effects of understanding problems of poverty could not be demonstrated. Based upon the understanding of the program's objectives, the faculty members developed outlines of the two course areas to beetaught.

1. Deprivation and its Effect on Learning
2. Learning and Teaching Theory

The first area was taught by the project director who is an assistant professor in the School of Social Work and Michael McAleenan, an Instructor in the Sociology Department. The second area was taught by Scott MacDonald, an associate professor in the Psychology Department and Gilferd Tanabe, an assistant professor in the same department.

All trainees participated in both courses. In order to keep the classes discussion size, half of the trainees met in each course in the morning and then switched courses in the afternoon, i.e., those who had Course One in the morning had Course Two in the afternoon and vice versa. Classes were held four days in each of the first two weeks. Field trips were held on the fifth day.

The first field trip was an attempt at observing marginal economic functioning on the Waialua Sugar Plantation in the rural North Shore area of Oahu. The trip was arranged through the Honolulu Community Action Program. Although the trainees were able to observe the isolation of the plantation workers and to hear the paternalistic attitudes towards the workers expressed by the plantation management, they did not see the workers as poor or not having opportunities that they themselves had. Actually, there were frequent statements that, with housing and medical services being provided for, the plantation workers had it better than they did. The natural beauty of the area and the wide open spaces of the farm land conveyed a feeling of freedom even though the C A P workers shared with the director and the director subsequently shared with the trainees the unavailability of doctors in the clinic and the failure of many workers, even after 20 years, to assimilate into the Hawaii society (the Plantation provides incentives for the workers to return to their native lands, which today is primarily the Philippines, and many of them do

return). Opportunities were provided to talk with workers in the Sugar Mill and in the fields. About a dozen teenagers working in the field were brought together so that we could talk with them. Some of the trainees availed themselves of the opportunities for dialogue, but most did not.

Although the trip was acknowledged as a great opportunity for the trainees to get to know one another, many felt that it did not give them the opportunity to see "poor people". This trip gave the group a feeling of togetherness and well being very early (the third day).

I was apprehensive that it was a peak too quickly reached, and the subsequent experience supported this feeling. An event took place on the trip that indicated that the program was in for some rocky moments. Both of the psychology professors remained aloof from the group throughout the day. Instead of riding on the bus with the group they rode in their own car and actually were not in the vicinity of the group during many periods of the day. Many of the trainees were aware of this and took them to task for their aloofness the next day. I, of course, also discussed this with them. They accepted the fact that they were being "told off" but gave the impression that their area of expertise and therefore their involvement in the program should not have to include such events as field trips. More than an impression was provided prior to the second field trip when Dr. MacDonald asked if he would have to participate. I

suggested that his involvement with the trainees in their experience could be educationally valuable for both. He agreed to participate.

The second field trip was acknowledged as being much more valuable in observing the life style of the poor. The arrangements for this trip were made by the Model Cities staff in the Kalihi-Palama area. Eight community people served as guides for small groups of trainees. The trainees had the opportunity of talking with them as well as with residents who the guides had arranged for them to talk with. A variety of living situations were explored and fruitful dialogues were held with residents. After the trip, the groups returned to Honolulu Community College and shared their experiences with each other. A few of the trainees had difficulty in accepting the reality of the words used by the poor in communicating and thereby revealed the difficulty that they in turn might have in communicating with the poor. The use of four-letter words caused some emotional unhinging.

As Dr. Polemis' evaluation report in the Appendix indicates, many of the participants felt at the time they came into the program that they had extensive knowledge in the areas of poverty and deprivation, and also that they had much experience in teaching disadvantaged students. We were able to glean from the applications that the trainees filled out that they had an interest in this area; however, the applications gave us no

indication of how much knowledge they felt they had in the area. Perhaps if we knew that such a large number of people already felt that they had knowledge in this area, and also that they might have ways of translating this knowledge into effective teaching, our screening process could have been more effective or the program could have been arranged differently. Actually, a good case can be made for including people with substantial knowledge in the area of poverty in that such people can contribute to each other's knowledge through the sharing process. However, as the evaluations indicate, many of the trainees wanted to be told or given information about poverty by the instructors rather than to learn in the classroom situation from each other. Paradoxically, they felt that they did learn from each other in informal situations. Perhaps in the development of future training programs separate programs can be developed for those who have minimal knowledge in the area of poverty and deprivation and those who have substantial knowledge. In this program it was difficult to meet the needs of both groups. The program for the first group could be realistically termed a training program with opportunities for direct instructional inputs and observational experiences included; while the program for the second group would be more appropriately termed a seminar and conducted at a different level. In the second situation, faculty would not be instructors per se, but would serve as discussion leaders. The function of faculty would then be different in each of these situations

and the distinctions could be clearly identified. In this training program faculty were both instructors and discussion leaders. Some of the group wanted more of one; some of the group wanted more of the other, and perhaps this reflected different needs among students in the program.

In response to III A 1 on the evaluation report outline, standardized test scores were not used in participant selection. Academic attainment was not a criterion. Current position was a consideration in that an attempt was made to get as many classroom teachers as possible in the program with a secondary consideration of faculty in counseling positions. We tried not to include people who were in administrative positions per se. Actually, we had no applications from administrators in any of the schools in Hawaii; however, as an evaluative footnote, it should be stated here that the participants in the program did indicate that a mixture of classroom teachers and administrators would be healthy. The reason for this is that a training program that deals with the deprived student must include an exploration of adjustments within the educational system that will facilitate meeting the learning needs of these students. Age was not a factor in selection nor were degrees or interviews. Recommendation by Dr. Doi and Mr. Chun was significant in the selection of Hawaii community college faculty. Geography was a factor in that the program was intended primarily for Hawaii teachers. Our faculty-participant ratio was approximately nine to one.

Due to the involvement of four different full-time faculty members, exposure to staff from the Honolulu Community Action Program, and exposure to staff and residents from the Model Cities, we did not use professionals as consultants nor did we utilize part-time faculty. The only consultants that were used in the program were the residents from the Kalihi-Palama Model Cities area and the students that were involved in the laboratory. However, it seems that a serious error was made in having the two psychology professors carry out as complete an involvement as they did have in the program. It seems with their very specific areas of interest that they could have been used more effectively as guest lecturers or part-time faculty carrying on much more limited responsibility than that which they actually had. Their participation in the program, as the evaluations of the participants indicate, had a serious negative effect on the morale and learning experience of the participants. It seems that much of the negative reaction to the program accrued from the negative influences of these two faculty members. A comment by one trainee seems to capture very concisely the influence that they had on the program: "Two faculty members were obviously very intelligent in their specialized field of clinical psychology but did a very poor job of teaching and establishing faculty-participant relations. This situation will probably be very significant in the ratings of this institute." The evaluations, both the one that was filled out for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

and the evaluation that was conducted by an independent researcher hired as a consultant by the training program, clearly indicate feelings around the three segments of the program. In order, the most valuable segment was the segment on "Deprivation and Its Effect on Learning"; the next valuable was the teaching laboratory; and the least valuable was "Learning and Teaching Theory". Comments have already been made on why and why not the effectiveness of the last two segments. The first segment seemed to be most effective because it dealt with the problems that most of the trainees seemed to enroll in the program to deal with and because the two faculty members were both interested in the problem of education for deprived students and desirous of creating an interest in teachers who were in positions that enabled them to enhance the students' academic development. In addition to lectures and group discussions, films, small sub-group meetings, brainstorming and extra luncheon sessions were held for the students. The instructors in this area involved themselves with the trainees at a variety of levels both in the program itself and in social activities outside of it. The students responded by indicating that the instructors in the first segment were knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the material that they taught. They provided an outline of expectation for the segment and then proceeded to follow that outline.

Participants in the program made suggestions from time to time on adjustments that ought to be made. These suggestions

were most frequently related to time schedules and to such things as changing group compositions. When these suggestions were made, they were put to a vote of the entire group. In most cases the group as a whole voted to maintain the status quo. A committee to follow up on the training program and to make recommendations for subsequent programs is being developed and will consist primarily of selected trainees from the Oahu community colleges.

The evaluation of this program is being conducted in four stages. The first stage was a preliminary attitude and expectation questionnaire that was administered to the trainees on the first day of the program. The first evaluation questionnaire was administered on the final day of the program. A ~~third~~ SECOND evaluation will be administered in December and the ~~fourth~~ THIRD evaluation will be administered in April. The thought behind administering the third and fourth questionnaires is to determine whether the attitudes of the trainees will have changed after they have had an opportunity to assimilate the inputs from the training program with actual teaching involvement, and further to determine whether there is a difference in perception from the point at which a program is concluded and points more further removed where opportunities for greater reflection exist.

## CONCLUSION

The appraisal of the program's worth is made in the evaluation memo submitted by Bernice Polemis, which follows as the first exhibit in the appendix. However, some general observation by the director follow:

I. A majority of the trainees saw a good deal of value in the program. What meaning the program will have to their actual teaching remains to be seen in the follow up evaluation. Some summary comments from the HEW Participant Evaluations submitted in the appendix state the worth of the training program at the time of its conclusion as:

   A. It provided inspiration, reassurance, and motivation through professional relationships established and exchanges of experience with colleagues.

   B. Broadened receptivity to different methods of teaching.

   C. Sharpened awareness of and interest in problems of the disadvantaged.

   D. Trainees learned how to reach a wider ability-range of students.

   E. Trainees developed a better appreciation of students' needs.

   F. Trainees learned to criticize a teaching situation through the eyes of students.

   G. Trainees had the experience of functioning in a team teaching situation.

H. Trainees gained a better or new understanding of the community college teacher's role.

I. Strong leadership, helpfulness, friendliness of faculty.

J. Field trips, especially the one to the Kalihi-Palama Model Cities Area.

II. The areas of weakness in the program most frequently commented on were:

A. Not enough field trips.

B. Not enough communication with poor people.

C. Out of the 20 students in the teaching lab only half qualified as poor or community college students. It therefore was not relevant enough to community college teachers.

D. More structure needed with specific reading assignments being required, and class discussion being more focused.

E. Trainees felt that instructors sometimes allowed discussion to wander and get off the track.

F. Poor instruction in the learning theory section.

G. Objectives, structure, and direction were not clear.

H. Time was too flexible, i.e., classes did not always start right on time.

III. The program was too broad. It attempted to do three things: 1) teach the nature of poverty and the relationship of the educational system to it, 2) teach learning theory which had

general implications for all students and not specifically the deprived student, and 3) through a practice teaching experience evaluate what did and did not have a positive learning impact on students. It would have been enough to concentrate on one of the three areas. One teacher could handle the area of concentration selected and utilize consultants and guest lecturers to augment his input. The three areas could be presented in follow up programs, but they should be Dent independently. In essence they were independent this summer and the fact that they were given under one course heading confused the trainees who probably were waiting for something that would pull everything together. It was originally hoped that the laboratory would be the synthesizing agent, but because the other areas were too diverse this expectation was never realized. If each area was presented as a separate concentration the trainees would then take from each area that which is valuable to them without consciously trying to make connections.

IV. There seems to be a need for courses that help teachers to go deeper into an understanding of poverty. These courses can have value to both the teacher who feels somewhat knowledgeable about the subject as well as to the teacher who has had little or no contact with impoverished students. A different course should be provided for each group in order that the different needs might be effectively met. An advanced course that would be given for those who have knowledge

of the nature of poverty and have had experience in teaching deprived students could meet in workshops with administrators in order to develop better communication between the teacher who is confronted directly with the affects of deprivation in the classroom and the administrator who will have to implement changes in structure and function when this is identified as needed. Discussions in the classroom, during the summer, indicated a need for a program that would bring teachers and administrators together. The trainees felt this would be the only realistic way to bring changes about, and that without this type of structured interchange discussion on administrative changes was simply playing a game.

V. Teachers from the mainland could be included in the course for those limited in their knowledge of poverty. Only teachers and administrators from Hawaii should be included in the more advanced course since they would be relating specifically to problems in Hawaii. This summer most of the mainland trainees seemed to tune out when we related too specifically to problems in the local community college situation, although two of them were very active in sharing and comparing experiences.

VI. If only one teacher teaches a course and utilizes resource people as needed the class size should be limited to twenty students. This would enable good communication to take

place among the students and between teacher and students. Besides being a good workable number for educational transactions it would facilitate establishment of rapport between participants. One teacher and twenty students might also allow for more flexibility in the program. The more people involved the harder it seems to switch gears.

VII. In attempting to understand the problems of being poor experiences that allow rubbing elbows with the poor should be provided to the trainees. Such experiences might include living with impoverished families. However, there would be two possible problems in this approach: 1) Difficulty in obtaining homes, and 2) unwillingness of trainees to participate in such an experience. Another possibility would be a program not conducted during the summer but during the regular school year that would enable contacts of varied kinds to be made. A short term summer program although more intense for a period of time limits the variety of experiences that trainees can have, because they can only involve themselves in the things that are happening at that time.

VIII. A two week program in both the beginning and advanced courses on poverty might be sufficient. If a live-in experience were developed, which might be especially valuable in a teacher-administrator seminar, a concentrated

one week program might be considered. For the live-in seminar Makaha Inn or a resort hotel on one of the neighbor islands could be utilized. Seclusion for this interchange would allow for informal interchange beyond an 8-hour day program and although expensive might very well be worth the cost.

IX. Certainly this training program was seen as experimental in the combination of all its components, and is the reason that it is being so carefully evaluated. At this point it can fairly safely asserted that it did not meet all of its expectations, but it did provide an opportunity to begin to concentrate on how the needs of deprived students can be met within the community college. The way to meet this need was elusive but we did have the opportunity to try out some concepts, and we did learn from the experience. Some of the ideas herein stated for improvements in conducting a program to meet the educational needs of the deprived student combined with planning that includes some participants of this training program with people who could participate in future programs should increase the value of subsequent experiences.

Evaluation Memo

To: Sidney Rosen, Director

From: Bernice W. Polemis, Evaluator

Subject: EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAM FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS

The first stage of the evaluation of the Training Program for Junior College Instructors has been completed, and the general conclusions are indicated below.

Method of evaluation: Two evaluative devices were used: (1) opinions of the participants towards the program as a whole, as well as towards its various components; and (2) an attitude instrument was developed to measure attitude towards teaching, towards the disadvantaged student, etc. The attitude instrument was administered at the beginning and end of the program, and the opinion instrument at the end of the program.

Trainees: While 37 individuals participated in the program, only 35 submitted evaluations in time for them to be included in this report. The other two trainees subsequently submitted their evaluations. The distribution of these 35 by certain background characteristics is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Women | 17 |
| Men | 18 |
| Graduated from University of Hawaii | 11 |
| From other schools | 24 |
| Less than 10 years teaching experience | 17 |
| 10 or more years teaching experience | 18 |
| Little previous experience in teaching the disadvantaged | 15 |
| Moderate or much experience in teaching the disadvantaged | 20 |
| Knowledge of the culture of poverty: | |
| Little | 19 |
| Much | 16 |

Overall evaluation

1. Most of the trainees considered the program valuable, and also would consider such a program valuable for most teachers and for teachers of the disadvantaged.

| | Value of participation | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Definitely | Possibly | Not at all |
| Own participation | 16 | 15 | 4 |
| For most teachers | 13 | 19 | 3 |
| Teachers of disadvantaged | 10 | 22 | 3 |

2. There is some indication that trainees from mainland colleges and those with more teaching experience and more experience in teaching the disadvantaged found the program more valuable than did those who had less overall teaching experience and less experience in teaching the disadvantaged. However, because of the small size of the sample, these differences were not statistically significant. (See Table 1 attached)

3. How valuable the participants considered the program is highly related Out of the 16 trainees who considered the program definitely valuable, only two indicated that they did not acquire much new knowledge.

| | Overall evaluation of the program | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| How much learned | Definitely Valuable | Possibly Valuable | Not at all Valuable |
| New ideas | | | |
| Much learned | 14 | 6 | -- |
| Little learned | 2 | 9 | 4 |
| Skills and knowledge | | | |
| Much learned | 13 | 5 | -- |
| Little learned | 3 | 10 | 4 |
| Knowledge of deprivation | | | |
| Much learned | 10 | 6 | -- |
| Little learned | 6 | 9 | 4 |

4. The reactions of the trainees to the various parts of the program, the teaching lab, the sections on learning theory, and on the effects of deprivation on learning were measured by a series of positive and negative adjectives. With the exception of the reactions to the learning theory part of the program, by far the majority of the trainees expressed at least some positive feeling.

| Part of Program | positive only | positive w/ anxiety | both positive and negative | negative only |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Effects of deprivation | 25 | -- | 3 | 7 |
| Learning theory | 14 | -- | 5 | 16 |
| Teaching lab | 15 | 5 | 6 | 9 |

In general (using the criteria of the percentage with no positive feelings), those who liked the teaching lab the least were the men, those with less teaching experience and with less knowledge of the culture of poverty. However, again these differences were not significant.

5. The overall evaluation of the program was related, as might be expected, to feelings about the components (analyzed in 4 above). Of the 16 who indicated the program was definitely valuable, only 3 indicated any negative reaction to the effects of deprivation component. The relationship to the other two components was not as close, 6 participants having negative or mixed feelings, while on the whole feeling the program was valuable.

| | Overall evaluation of program | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Definitely Valuable | Possibly Valuable | Not at all Valuable |
| Learning theory | | | |
| Positive only toward component | 10 | 4 | -- |
| Negative and mixed | 6 | 11 | 4 |
| Teaching lab | | | |
| Positive only toward component | 10 | 6 | -- |
| Negative and mixed | 6 | 9 | 4 |
| Effects of deprivation | | | |
| Positive only toward component | 13 | 10 | 1 |
| Negative and mixed | 3 | 5 | 3 |

6. Increase in knowledge and skill was measured by a series of 18 items which participants used to indicate how much they thought they had learned from the program. As indicated in Item 5 above, this was closely related to their overall evaluation. An item analysis indicates that three kinds of information impressed all but a small minority of the trainees. These items were: awareness of the communications gap between the educational system and the poor, cultural attitudes that affect relationships among people, and a feeling for the special problems that affect poor people. (See Table 2 attached).

7. Knowledge of the culture of poverty appeared to be almost completely unrelated to any part of the evaluative structure. There is even only a slight hint that those with more knowledge learned slightly less about the effects of deprivation and that they were more negative towards the learning theory component. However, these differences may be chance variations.

Analysis of Attitude Instrument:

8. Overall conclusions on initial attitudes and change in attitude: (method of analysis is indicated in Paragraph 9 below). On Factors A and C the younger, the men, the mainland school graduate, the Caucasians were found to be more rigid; on Factors G and I, the men, those with little experience in teaching the deprived, and those with little knowledge of the culture of poverty were found to be more rigid. Positive changes in attitude were experienced to a greater extent by the younger trainees, by the men, by those with less teaching experience, and by those with less knowledge of the culture of poverty. (See Table 3 attached)

   There is little if any relation of the overall evaluation discussed in Paragraph One to the initial attitudes of the participants or to the changes in attitudes. In other words, the overall evaluation is not related to attitude or to change in attitude. How the trainees felt about the program does not reflect whether their attitude changed or not.

9. Factor A - "Learning" factor

| | |
|---|---|
| Item 15 | Most poor students want the credit for a course, they don't really want to learn anything |
| Item 17 | Instructors make the best use of their time when they give attention to the students who are most interested and capable of learning |
| Item 22 | An individual instructor can do little to change a student's attitude towards learning |
| Item 34 | Grades have a negative effect on learning ability (negative loading) |
| Item 35 | Grades are highly associated with student anxiety (neg.loading) |

Factor C "Realism" factor

| | |
|---|---|
| Item 14 | A teacher with many students has no time to give to students who have difficulties in learning |
| Item 16 | Teachers really have to give their attention to the class as a whole, and if some students fall by the wayside, that's just the way life is. |
| Item 18 | Kids who have a poor background, unfortunately, are probably not going to make it regardless of what you do |
| Item 28 | Students really respect teachers who set strict rules and don't deviate from them |

Factor G "Expectations" factor

| | |
|---|---|
| Item 6 | While there may be exceptions, most kids expect to finish their B.A. when they start junior college |
| Item 9 | While there may be exceptions, the main reason poor kids don't do well in school is that they are lazy |
| Item 11 | Usually students who have trouble learning aren't worth the time you spend on them |
| Item 27 | The teacher is the sole judge of what the course should contain |
| Item 30 | Instructors who use students as consustants on course content or method of teaching generally find the students don't contribute much |

Factor I "Role" factor

| | |
|---|---|
| Item 13 | If a student doesn't have assignments done he needs to be talked to about the importance of good study habits |
| Item 32 | Students learn the most when they make the greatest effort to meet the standard set by the instructor |
| Item 33 | The primary role of the teacher is to set the standards for the course and to see that the students measure up to this standard |
| Item 36 | Grades give credit where credit is due |
| Item 39 | Grades really show how much a student has learned |

Total scores were computed for each factor for each of the trainees. These factor scores, which indicate essentially the extent to which the trainee "agrees" or "disagrees" with the general idea of the factor, were then used as the basis of two analyses:

(1) the analysis of difference in attitudes by characteristic of the trainee
(2) an analysis of changes in attitudes

Note that for each of the factors a low score indicates an essentially more rigid, more traditional, less flexible attitude, and a high score indicates a less rigid, more progressive and more flexible attitude.

A difference score was developed based on changes in the four factors. This score is as follow:

1 positive change on all factors
2 weak positive - positives and neutrals
3 no change
4 weak negative - negatives and neutrals
5 negative change on all factors

Recommendations for evaluation of future programs:

1. The attitude instrument be further refined for greater reliability.

2. A better way of measuring the trainees' knowledge of the effects of deprivation at an initial point be developed.

3. The background variables be more clearly developed so that there is greater generalisability.

TABLE I

Overall Evaluation
Participation in the Program by Background Characteristics

Value of Participation

Sex

| | Male | Female |
|---|---|---|
| Total | 17 | 18 |
| Definitely | 8 | 8 |
| Possibly | 7 | 8 |
| Not | 2 | 2 |

School

| | Mainland | Univ. of Hawaii |
|---|---|---|
| Total | 24 | 11 |
| Definitely | 14 | 2 |
| Possibly | 7 | 8 |
| Not | 3 | 1 |

Total teaching experience

| | less than 10 | 10 years or more |
|---|---|---|
| Total | 17 | 18 |
| Definitely | 6 | 10 |
| Possibly | 9 | 6 |
| Not | 2 | 2 |

Previous experience in teaching disadvantaged

| | Much/Mod | Little/None |
|---|---|---|
| Total | 20 | 15 |
| Definitely | 11 | 5 |
| Possibly | 8 | 7 |
| Not | 1 | 3 |

Knowledge of culture of poverty

| | Much | Little |
|---|---|---|
| Total | 16 | 19 |
| Definitely | 7 | 9 |
| Possibly | 5 | 10 |
| Not | 4 | 0 |

No statistically significant differences for this sample size.

Where teaching

| | Mainland | Hawaii |
|---|---|---|
| Total | 6 | 29 |
| Definitely | 3 | 13 |
| Possibly | 2 | 13 |
| Not | 1 | 3 |

TABLE 2

Increases in Knowledge and Skill

(Trainees' Evaluation - Questionnaire C)

| | Much | Moderate | Little | % Moderate and Much |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Awareness of communications gap between ed. systems & poor | 12 | 16 | 7 | 80.0 |
| Cultural attitudes that affect relationships among people | 11 | 15 | 9 | 74.2 |
| A feeling for the special problems that affect poor people | 9 | 13 | 13 | 62.9 |
| New ideas about people | 9 | 17 | 9 | 74.2 |
| An understanding of how poverty affects learning | 8 | 16 | 11 | 68.5 |
| New ideas of motivation | 6 | 17 | 12 | 65.7 |
| Specific teaching techniques | 6 | 17 | 12 | 65.7 |
| Specific changes in own behavior | 6 | 17 | 12 | 65.7 |
| Knowledge about how to communicate | 6 | 15 | 14 | 60.0 |
| How teachers can motivate students | 5 | 18 | 12 | 65.7 |
| How to organize better | 4 | 7 | 24 | 31.4 |
| Knowledge of how it feels to be poor | 4 | 14 | 17 | 51.4 |
| New ideas of how people learn | 4 | 15 | 16 | 54.2 |

TABLE 3

Change in Attitude

| | Change | |
|---|---|---|
| Age | Positive change | Little or no change |
| Total | 16 | |
| Under 40 | 11 | 7 |
| 40 & over | 5 | 12 |
| Sex | | |
| Male | 10 | 7 |
| Female | 6 | 12 |
| College | | |
| UH | 5 | 6 |
| Mainland | 10 | 11 |
| Experience Total Teaching | | |
| Under 10 years | 10 | 7 |
| 10 & over | 6 | 12 |
| Teaching Junior College | | |
| Under 4 years | 7 | 6 |
| 4 yrs. & more | 9 | 13 |
| Disadvantaged Experience in Teaching | | |
| Little or none | 11 | 4 |
| Mod. to very much | 5 | 15 |
| Of Poverty Knowledge of Culture | | |
| Much | 7 | 9 |
| Little | 9 | 10 |

attitude instrument

Name _____

Training Program for Community College
Educators of Deprived College Students

Questionnaire A

July 24, 1970

In order to evaluate this program, and to plan such programs in the future, we would like to know your opinions on certain subjects in relation to teaching and learning. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO ANY OF THESE QUESTIONS. Some of the questions may seem to be repetitious to you, but there are no trick questions. The best response is undoubtedly your first reaction to the question. Your honest responses will help us immeasureably in evaluating the program (we are not interested in evaluating you).

Part A: Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements (without qualification). Circle the appropriate code.

| | Agree Strong | Agree Slight | Disagree Strong | Disagree Slight |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Unless there is a good attitude towards learning in the home, kids are not likely to do well in school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. While there may be exceptions, most "poor" parents don't really care how well their kids do in school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Parents have a lot of influence on whether their kids go to college or not. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. While there may be exceptions, most kids go to junior college because they aren't really capable of doing college work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. If a parent does not think his kids should go beyond high school the kid doesn't have a very good chance of making it in junior college. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. While there may be exceptions, most kids expect to finish their BA when they start junior college. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. Teachers can't counteract the influence of the family. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. Lower class students are really no different from middle class students when it comes to feelings about school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. While there may be exceptions, the main reason poor kids don't do well in school, is that they are lazy. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

| | Agree Strong | Agree Slight | Disagree Strong | Disagree Slight |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. Students learn better if they feel the teacher likes them. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. Usually students who have trouble in learning aren't worth the time you spend on them. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. The greatest pleasure a teacher can have is to see a student understand something he didn't understand before. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13. If a student doesn't have his assignments done, he needs to be talked to about the importance of good study habits. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14. A teacher with many students has no time to give to students who have difficulties in learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15. Most poor students want the credit for a course, they don't really want to learn anything. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16. Teachers really have to give their attention to the class as a whole, and if some students fall by the wayside, that's just the way life is. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 17. Instructors make the best use of their time when they give the most attention to the students who are most interested and capable of learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 18. Kids who have a poor background, unfortunately, are probably not going to make it regardless of what you do. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 19. A student should always be given the feeling that he can do better, however badly he has done in the past. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 20. A teacher has the professional responsibility for teaching his subject the way it should be taught, regardless of the background of the students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 21. A teacher with an accepting attitude can do a lot for kids even when they have a poor background. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 22. An individual instructor can do little to change a student's attitude towards learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 23. The effects of poverty on the learning ability of a student have been much overrated. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

| | Agree Strong | Agree Slight | Disagree Strong | Disagree Slight |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 24. An instructor doesn't really have the time to find out about his student's backgrounds. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 25. Students really have to be responsible for their own learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 26. Students don't really see teachers as trying to help them learn. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| **Part B** | | | | |
| 1. The teacher is the sole judge of what the course should contain. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Students really respect teachers who set strict rules and don't deviate from them. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Instructors should generally give serious consideration to student complaints. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Instructors who use students as consultants on course content or method of teaching generally find the students don't contribute much. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Only a very few students feel that they are competent to have a part in the determination of course content and method of teaching. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Students learn the most when they make the greatest effort to meet the standard set by the instructor. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. The primary role of the teacher is to set the standards for the course and to see that the students measure up to this standard. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| **Part C** | | | | |
| 1. Grades may have a negative effect on the learning ability of a student. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Grades are highly associated with student anxiety. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Grades give credit where credit is due. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Most students would learn as much if there was only a pass-fail. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |

| | Agree Strong | Agree Slight | Disagree Strong | Disagree Slight |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. If it weren't for the threat of a poor grade, most students would do very little studying. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Grades really show how much a student has learned. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. It's important to know how students stack up against each other. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Part D

We would like to know your expectations of this program:
To what extent do you expect to obtain each of the following (circle code)?

| | Very High | High | Mod | Low | Very Low |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Information on learning theory in general | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Information on learning problems of deprived students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Information on the relationship of student background to learning | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. An ability to understand my students better | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. An ability to motivate my students to learn better | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Skills and techniques to increase the deprived students' desire to learn | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Skills and techniques that will make me more effective | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Skills and techniques that will enable me to plan my courses better | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. A change in my attitude that will enable me to teach the deprived student better | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. An opportunity to share with others my experiences in teaching the deprived student | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. I expect to learn most from my instructors in the program | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. In class, as well as out, I expect to learn much from my fellow students in the program | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

We would also like to know your feelings in anticipating the program. To what extent does each of the following words describe your expectations about the program? (Circle code)

| | Very High | High | Moderate | Low | Very Low |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Interesting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Demanding | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Frightening | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Exciting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Highly involving | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Not too different from other courses I've had | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Thought provoking | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Casual and relaxed | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Difficult | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 10. Valuable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

---

THANK YOU (hope you didn't give up)

Comments on the questionnaire:
(any help you can give us will be appreciated, and given serious consideration).

Opinion Instrument

TRAINING PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE
EDUCATORS OF DEPRIVED COLLEGE STUDENTS

Name _____

1 2 _____ ID

Questionnaire B

Individual Background

1. Age

3
1 Under 25
2 25 but under 30
3 30 but under 35
4 35 but under 40
5 40 but under 45
6 45 but under 50
7 50 and over

2. Sex

4
1 Male
2 Female

3. Education

5
1 Less than Bachelor's Degree
2 Bachelor's Degree
3 Work beyond Bachelor's but not including Master's
4 Master's Degree
5 Work beyond Master's but not including Ph.D.
6 Ph.D. or Ed.D.

4. College from which undergraduate degree was earned (enter name)

6 _____

5. Undergraduate major

7 8 _____ or

Area of vocational skill

9 _____

6. What subject or subjects are you teaching _____

10 11 _____

7. Total teaching experience at any level (no. of years)

12 _____

8. Teaching experience at junior college or university (no. of years) _____

13

9. Length of work experience (if a trade) (no. of years)

14 _____

10. Previous experience in teaching disadvantaged students

15
1 Very much experience
2 Moderate experience
3 A little experience
4 No experience

11. Knowledge of the culture of poverty (previous to this course)

16
1 Much
2 Little
3 None

12. Source of knowledge of the culture of poverty

17
1 Newspapers & books
2 Personal contact with poor people
3 Personal experience of friends or relatives
4 Own personal experience

13. Ethnic group

18
1 Both parents Japanese
2 Both parents Caucasian
3 Both parents Chinese
4 Both parents other Oriental (including mixed)
5 Mixed Caucasian & Oriental
6 Both parents Hawaiian
7 Other part Hawaiian
8 Other

14. Where are you teaching

19
1 California
2 Other Mainland
3 Hawaii

Training Program for Community College
Educators of Deprived College Students

Questionnaire C

_____ Name _____
ID

For each of the following, indicate to what extent this program increased your knowledge or skill: (circle code)

| | | Little | Moderate | Much |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | 1. New ideas about people in general or students in particular | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 21 | 2. New ideas of how people learn | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 22 | 3. New ideas of motivation | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 23 | 4. How teachers can motivate students to learn | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 24 | 5. New ideas about myself and my own behavior | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 25 | 6. Specific techniques I might put into practice in my own teaching. | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 26 | 7. Specific changes I might make in my own behavior towards students | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 27 | 8. Knowledge of how to organize better | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 28 | 9. Knowledge about how to communicate better | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 29 | 10. More knowledge of how it feels to be poor | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 30 | 11. Cultural attitudes that affect relationships among people | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 31 | 12. A feeling for the special problems that affect poor people | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 32 | 13. An understanding of how poverty affects learning | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 33 | 14. An awareness of the communications gap between the educational system and poor people | 1 | 2 | 3 |

---

34 35 15. How would you characterize the teaching lab: (Circle as many as you wish)

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Painful | 4 | Interesting | 7 | Boring |
| 2 | Worth what it cost | 5 | Exciting | 8 | A waste of time |
| 3 | A good way to learn | 6 | Anxiety producing | 9 | Irritating |

36 37 16. How would you characterize the class discussions on learning theory: (Circle as many as you wish)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Interesting and exciting | 4 | Irritating |
| 2 | Boring | 5 | A waste of time |
| 3 | Thought provoking | 6 | Very valuable |

Questionnaire C (continued)

38 39 17. How would you characterize the class discussions on the effects of deprivation and poverty on learning: (Circle as many as you wish)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Interesting and exciting | 4 | Irritating |
| 2 | Boring | 5 | A waste of time |
| 3 | Thought provoking | 6 | Very valuable |

18. How valuable did you feel that each of the following was: (Circle code)

| | | Very 1 | Somewhat 2 | Not at all 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40 | a. Observing others teach | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 41 | b. Participating in the teaching group | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 42 | c. The critique of the teaching group | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 43 | d. Being criticized by the students | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 44 | e. Being criticized by the other trainees | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 45 | f. Preparing for teaching | 1 | 2 | 3 |

46 19. Overall evaluation:

a. I feel my participation in this program was:
   1. Definitely valuable
   2 Possibly valuable
   3 Not valuable

47 20. I feel that this program would be valuable for most teachers
   1 Definitely
   2 Possibly
   3 Not at all

48 21. I feel that this program would be valuable for all teachers who will be teaching disadvantaged students:
   1 Definitely
   2 Possibly
   3 Not at all

Comment on each of the following.

22. Length of the total program (i.e. right length, should be shorter, longer)

23. What part of the program did you find most valuable?

24. What did you find least valuable, and why?

25. Recommendations for changes in the format, content, etc. of the program.

$\overline{49}$ $\overline{50}$ I

$\overline{51}$ $\overline{52}$ II.

$\overline{53}$ $\overline{54}$ III

$\overline{55}$ $\overline{56}$ IV

$\overline{57}$ $\overline{58}$ V

$\overline{59}$ $\overline{60}$ VI

$\overline{60}$ $\overline{61}$ I

$\overline{62}$ $\overline{63}$ II

$\overline{64}$ $\overline{65}$ III

$\overline{66}$ $\overline{67}$ IV

$\overline{68}$ $\overline{69}$ V

$\overline{70}$ $\overline{71}$ VI

$\overline{72}$

$\overline{73}$

The University of Hawaii School of Social Work
in Cooperation with the Community College System
Announces a

# TRAINING PROGRAM FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATORS OF ACADEMICALLY DEPRIVED COLLEGE STUDENTS

This program is made possible through a grant from the U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, Office of Education under Part E of the Education Professions Development Act, P.L. 90-35.

PERTINENT FACTS ABOUT THE TRAINING PROGRAM:

WHEN: July 27 - August 14, 1970 (The program will be conducted from 9:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. Monday through Friday for the 3 week period)

WHERE: Honolulu Community College

WHO IS ELIGIBLE: Teachers and administrators from the six Hawaii Community Colleges plus selected educators from the mainland

NO. OF PARTICIPANTS: ~~30~~ 40

CREDIT: 3 hours of graduate credit

STIPEND: $75/week for all participants

APPLICATION PROCEDURE:

Write to: Sidney M. Rosen, Director
Training Program for Jr. College Educators
School of Social Work
University of Hawaii
1395 Lower Campus Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Request: Applications for the Training Program and the stipend

Applications will be sent immediately upon request and should be returned as soon as possible. The deadline for applications to be returned is May 15, 1970. Applicants will be notified of their status as participants the week of May 25, 1970 and those that are selected will be asked to return a card indicating their intent to participate.

STAFF:

Sidney M. Rosen, M.S.W., Asst. Prof., School of Social Work, Director

Edith Doi, Ed.D., Dean of Students, Kapiolani Community College, Asst. Director

Michael McAleenan, M.A., Dept. of Sociology

Scott MacDonald, Ph.D., Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Psychology

Gil Tanabe, Ph.D., Asst. Prof., Dept. of Psychology

PURPOSE OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM:

1. To give the "open door policy" meaning by not only allowing the academically, and often socially and economically, deprived student to begin his higher education but to sustain him in the academic setting as well.

2. To help the teacher develop skills and techniques that will enable the education of the deprived student to be more rewarding for both teacher and student.

3. To help the teacher understand the social and cultural factors that affect learning.

4. To evaluate features in the community college system that might enhance as well as impede the implementation of knowledge and skills gained through the training program.

PROCEDURES TO BE USED IN MEETING GOALS:

1. Rap sessions with deprived students who expect to enter or are already enrolled in community college.

2. Dialogue with residents of disadvantaged communities.

3. Lectures and discussions on learning theories and techniques.

4. Practicum utilizing experiential and theoretical inputs.

5. Evaluations of practicum experiences.

A significant amount of work will take place in the community itself. Ample use will be made of audio and video tapings of practicums and dialogues.

In selecting individuals for participation and otherwise in the administration of this program, the University of Hawaii School of Social Work will not discriminate on the ground of the race, creed, or national origin of any applicant or participant.

March 31, 1970

Mr. Raymond Y. C. Won, Provost
Kapiolani Community College
620 Pensacola Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

Dear Mr. Won:

I am pleased to announce a three week summer course, which will be conducted from August 10 to August 28 entitled "Training Program for Junior College Educators of Academically Deprived College Students." This program is funded by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare under Part E of the Education Professions Development Act, P.L. 90-39. The program is a cooperative venture between the University of Hawaii School of Social Work and the Community Colleges.

The purpose of the course is to help teachers develop and enhance the social and cultural awareness and teaching techniques that will make it possible to sustain the academically disadvantaged student in the community college setting after he has entered it via the "open door policy." Where educational opportunities are provided by a liberalized admissions policy the opportunities might very well be wasted unless the student can be helped to function productively after he has entered the academic system. A goal of this program is to make the opportunity pay off.

Teachers who have had the type of student we are talking about know the frustration that develops in trying to teach him. It is the intent of the training program to help the relationship between teacher and student be satisfying and rewarding.

I am enclosing a brief description of the program plus important data for your information and the information of your faculty. Please post one copy and distribute the remainder to faculty. Requests to apply will be answered immediately and since we have only thirty openings interested people should be encouraged to indicate their interest immediately.

Please let me know if you have additional questions.

Yours truly,

Sidney M. Rosen
Training Program Director

SMR:mm

Enc.

cc: Walter Chun

Same letter sent to the following:

COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF HAWAII

Mr. Albert M. Nagy, Provost
Honolulu Community College
874 Dillingham Boulevard
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

Mr. Raymond Y. C. Won, Provost
Kapiolani Community College
620 Pensacola Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

Dr. Leonard D. Tuthill, Provost
Leeward Community College
96-050 Farrington Highway
Pearl City, Hawaii 96782

Dr. Philip K. Ige, Provost
Kauai Community College
RR 1, Box 216
Lihue, Kauai, Hawaii 96766

Dr. John P. Hoshor, Provost
Maui Community College
310 Kaahumanu Avenue
Kahului, Maui, Hawaii 96732

Mr. Mitsugu Sumada, Director
Hawaii Technical School*
1175 Manono Street
Hilo, Hawaii 96720

*As of July 1, this school will officially be called Hawaii Community College.

Dear Applicant:

Thank you for your interest in the "Training Program for Junior College Educators of Academically Deprived College Students." I am enclosing both the application for the program as well as an application for a stipend (a stipend of $75/week will be paid to participants).

Since we can only accept thirty people into the program you are encouraged to return the applications immediately. The deadline for applications is May 15. You will receive notification regarding your participation in the program the week of May 25.

A description of the program is enclosed.

Yours truly,

Sidney M. Rosen
Project Director

SMR:mm

Enclosures

(NOTE: Dates for the training program have been changed to July 27 to August 14.)

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Dear Applicant:

Please fill out and return directly to the U.S. Office of Education. Do not send to the School of Social Work.

Thank you for your cooperation.

SIDNEY M. ROSEN
Project Director

SMR:mm

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

# APPLICANT INFORMATION

Institutes, Short-Term Training Programs and Special Projects Under Part E of the Education Professions Development Act *(EPDA, Public Law 90-35)* – 1970-71

BUDGET BUREAU NO. 51-R0814
APPROVAL EXPIRES: 1/31/71

PROGRAM NUMBER

05248

**INSTRUCTIONS:** THIS INFORMATION WILL NOT BE USED TO EVALUATE THE QUALIFICATIONS OF AN INDIVIDUAL FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE EPDA, PART E TRAINING PROGRAM. IT WILL BE USED BY THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION ONLY TO COLLECT AGGREGATE DATA ON CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL APPLICANTS. Please complete all items carefully. The form must be *MAILED DIRECTLY TO THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION* at the address given below in the envelope provided.

U.S. Office of Education
Bureau of Higher Education
Division of College Support
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
ATTENTION: Dr. Paul H. Carnell

**OFFICE OF EDUCATION USE ONLY**

1. APPLICANT STATUS
(1) ☐ SELECTED AS PARTICIPANT
(2) ☐ SELECTED AS PARTICIPANT BUT DID NOT ATTEND
(3) ☐ SELECTED AS ALTERNATE
(4) ☐ NOT SELECTED

2. NAME *(Last, First, Middle Initial)*

3. SEX
(1) ☐ MALE (2) ☐ FEMALE

4. AGE
(1) ☐ 19 YEARS OLD OR YOUNGER
(2) ☐ 20 THROUGH 30 YEARS OF AGE
(3) ☐ 31 THROUGH 40 YEARS OF AGE
(4) ☐ 41 THROUGH 50 YEARS OF AGE
(5) ☐ 51 THROUGH 60 YEARS OF AGE
(6) ☐ 61 YEARS OR OLDER

5A. ARE YOU A MEMBER OF A MINORITY GROUP?
(1) ☐ YES (2) ☐ NO

5B. IF "YES", CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX
(1) ☐ AMERICAN INDIAN
(2) ☐ AMERICAN NEGRO
(3) ☐ CUBAN
(4) ☐ MEXICAN-AMERICAN
(5) ☐ ORIENTAL
(6) ☐ PUERTO RICAN
(7) ☐ OTHER *(Specify)* _____

6A. ARE YOU A VETERAN?
(1) ☐ YES (2) ☐ NO

6B. IF "YES", OF WHICH WAR?
(1) ☐ WORLD WAR II
(2) ☐ KOREAN WAR
(3) ☐ VIETNAM WAR
(4) ☐ OTHER *(Specify)* _____

7. NAME OF EPDA, PART E TRAINING PROGRAM TO WHICH YOU ARE APPLYING

8. HAVE YOU ATTENDED A PREVIOUS EPDA, PART E TRAINING PROGRAM?
(1) ☐ YES (2) ☐ NO

9A. ARE YOU PRESENTLY EMPLOYED?
(1) ☐ YES (2) ☐ NO

9B. IF "YES", ENTER NAME OF EMPLOYER

10A. DO YOU EXPECT TO BE EMPLOYED AT THE INSTITUTION NAMED IN ITEM 9B AFTER COMPLETION OF EPDA, PART E TRAINING PROGRAM?
(1) ☐ YES (2) ☐ NO

10B. IF ANSWER IS "NO", WHAT IS THE NAME OF THE INSTITUTION AT WHICH YOU WILL BE EMPLOYED AFTER COMPLETION OF TRAINING? ENTER BELOW.

11. IN COLUMN A, CHECK THE TYPE OF INSTITUTION WHERE YOU ARE PRESENTLY EMPLOYED; THEN IN COLUMN B, CHECK THE INSTITUTION IN WHICH YOU PLAN TO BE EMPLOYED AFTER COMPLETION OF EPDA, PART E TRAINING PROGRAM *(Trustees, regents, or board members of educational institutions should indicate type of educational institution with which associated)*

| | A. PRESENT INSTITUTION | B. FUTURE INSTITUTION |
|---|---|---|
| (1) | ☐ 2-YEAR COLLEGE OR TECHNICAL INSTITUTE | ☐ |
| (2) | ☐ 4-YEAR UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE | ☐ |
| (3) | ☐ UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE INSTITUTION | ☐ |
| (4) | ☐ ELEMENTARY OR SECONDARY SCHOOL | ☐ |
| (5) | ☐ OTHER EDUCATIONAL AGENCY OR ASSOCIATION *(Specify)* _____ | ☐ |
| (6) | ☐ OTHER *(Specify)* _____ | ☐ |
| (7) | ☐ TYPE OF INSTITUTION UNKNOWN | ☐ |
| (8) | ☐ NOT EMPLOYED | |

12. INDICATE CONTROL OF THE INSTITUTION(S) IN WHICH YOU ARE PRESENTLY EMPLOYED AND EXPECT TO BE EMPLOYED AFTER COMPLETION OF EPDA, PART E TRAINING PROGRAM:

| 12A. PRESENT INSTITUTION | 12B. FUTURE INSTITUTION |
|---|---|
| (1) ☐ PUBLIC (2) ☐ PRIVATE | (1) ☐ PUBLIC (2) ☐ PRIVATE |

13. IN COLUMN A, CHECK YOUR PRESENT OCCUPATION; THEN IN COLUMN B, CHECK YOUR FUTURE OCCUPATION *(If known)* AFTER COMPLETION OF EPDA, PART E TRAINING PROGRAM. *(Check only your major occupation) (Trustees, regents, or board members of educational institutions should indicate major position in the educational institution)*

| A. PRESENT OCCUPATION | B. FUTURE OCCUPATION | A. PRESENT OCCUPATION | B. FUTURE OCCUPATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| (1) ☐ TEACHER | (1) ☐ | (5) ☐ GRADUATE STUDENT | (5) ☐ |
| (2) ☐ ADMINISTRATOR | (2) ☐ | (6) ☐ OTHER *(Specify)* _____ | (6) ☐ |
| (3) ☐ STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES OFFICER | (3) ☐ | (7) ☐ RETIRED | (7) ☐ |
| (4) ☐ OTHER EDUCATIONAL SPECIALIST | (4) ☐ | | FUTURE OCCUPATION UNKNOWN (8) ☐ |

14. IN COLUMN A, CHECK PRESENT AREA OF SPECIALIZATION, THEN IN COLUMN B, CHECK YOUR FUTURE AREA OF SPECIALIZATION *(If known)* AFTER COMPLETION OF EPDA, PART E TRAINING PROGRAM *(Check only your major area)*

| A. PRESENT AREA OF SPECIALIZATION | B. FUTURE AREA OF SPECIALIZATION | A. PRESENT AREA OF SPECIALIZATION | B. FUTURE AREA OF SPECIALIZATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| (1) ☐ ADMISSIONS AND/OR REGISTRAR | (1) ☐ | (11) ☐ NATURAL SCIENCE OR MATHEMATICS | (11) ☐ |
| (2) ☐ ADMINISTRATION – GENERAL | (2) ☐ | (12) ☐ PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION *(Law, medicine, etc.)* | (12) ☐ |
| (3) ☐ ADULT EDUCATION | (3) ☐ | (13) ☐ PROGRAMS FOR EDUC. DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS | (13) ☐ |
| (4) ☐ BUSINESS EDUCATION | (4) ☐ | (14) ☐ SOCIAL SCIENCES | (14) ☐ |
| (5) ☐ COLLEGE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT | (5) ☐ | (15) ☐ STUDENT FINANCIAL AID | (15) ☐ |
| (6) ☐ DEVELOPMENT AND/OR FUND-RAISING | (6) ☐ | (16) ☐ STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES | (16) ☐ |
| (7) ☐ EDUCATIONAL MEDIA | (7) ☐ | (17) ☐ TRAINING OF ELEM. OR SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS | (17) ☐ |
| (8) ☐ ENGINEERING | (8) ☐ | (18) ☐ VOCATIONAL EDUCATION | (18) ☐ |
| (9) ☐ HUMANITIES | (9) ☐ | (19) ☐ OTHER *(Specify)* _____ | (19) ☐ |
| (10) ☐ LIBRARY WORK | (10) ☐ | | |

15. WHAT IS THE HIGHEST DEGREE YOU NOW HOLD?

(1) ☐ BACHELOR'S
(2) ☐ MASTER'S
(3) ☐ DEGREE BEYOND MASTER'S BUT LESS THAN DOCTORATE
(4) ☐ DOCTORATE
(5) ☐ OTHER *(Specify)* _____

16A. DO YOU PLAN TO WORK FOR AN ADVANCED DEGREE?

(1) ☐ YES (2) ☐ NO

16B. IF "YES", WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING DEGREES WILL YOU WORK FOR?

(1) ☐ BACHELOR'S
(2) ☐ MASTER'S
(3) ☐ DEGREE BEYOND THE MASTER'S BUT LESS THAN THE DOCTORATE
(4) ☐ DOCTORATE
(5) ☐ OTHER *(Specify)*

17. DO YOU PLAN TO USE THE EPDA, PART E TRAINING PROGRAM AS PART OF YOUR WORK FOR AN ADVANCED DEGREE?

(1) ☐ YES (2) ☐ NO

18A. DO YOU PLAN TO UNDERTAKE GRADUATE STUDY IMMEDIATELY AFTER COMPLETION OF THE EPDA, PART E TRAINING PROGRAM? (1) ☐ YES (2) ☐ NO

18B. IF "YES", WILL YOUR GRADUATE STUDY BE

(1) ☐ FULL TIME (2) ☐ PART TIME

**FOR OFFICE OF EDUCATION USE ONLY**

19.

(1) ☐ DEVELOPING INSTITUTION (2) ☐ PREDOMINATELY BLACK

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

July 10, 1970

Dear Participant:

A short note to let you know that the Training Program for Community College Educators of Academically Deprived College Students will begin at 9 A.M. in Room 102 at Honolulu Community College on July 27.

The College has cafeteria facilities which are open throughout the day. Parking is available on campus but due to construction is limited. To avoid a scramble, arrive about 15 minutes early for class. If you plan to use public transportation, contact the Honolulu Rapid Transit Co. at 537-4571 for service information.

University registration will take place on the first day of the program. All materials will be available at the Honolulu Community College. You should not register through the University of Hawaii regular registration procedure.

For additional questions that you might have, please call me at 944-7182.

Sincerely,

Sidney M. Rosen
Project Director

# UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

School of Social Work

May 25, 1970

Dear Applicant:

I am very pleased to announce that you have been accepted as a participant in the Training Program for Junior College Educators of Deprived College Students.

A brief reminder. The program will begin at 9:00 a.m., on July 27, 1970 at Honolulu Community College. I am enclosing a map of the campus. Please note Building #4 on the map which is where we will assemble. Note, also, Rooms 102, 103, and 106 which will be used as classrooms.

You will also find a self-addressed envelope. Please check whether you will be attending the program or whether your plans have changed so that you will be unable to attend. It is extremely important that the information reach us no later than June 12, as there are many people on our alternate list that would like to participate in the program if you cannot attend .

I look forward to meeting you.

Sincerely yours,

Sidney M. Rosen
Program Director

SMR:at

Enclosures

1395 Lower Campus Road · Honolulu, Hawaii 96822 / Cable Address: UNIHAW

Dear Mr. Rosen,

__X__ I will attend the Training Program

_____ I am sorry but my plans have changed and I will not attend.

Joyce S. Tsunoda
Candidate's Signature

SHR:at

# UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

School of Social Work

May 25, 1970

Dear Applicant:

I've been gratified by the great interest that has been expressed in attending the Training Program for Junior College Educators of Academically Deprived College Students. It is unfortunate that with a limit as to the number of people we could accept, not all applicants can be guaranteed an opportunity to attend.

Consideration was given first to Hawaii applicants, second, to people who did not have similar training experiences in the past, and third, to those who, it seemed to the screening committee, could use the program for current or imminent experiences.

Since, you may not have fit into one or more of the above criteria we have placed you on our alternate candidates' list. There is a good chance that some of the alternates may yet be able to participate in the program.

Please return the enclosed information slip by June 12, 1970 and let us know whether you wish to have your name maintained on the alternate list.

We will inform you no later than June 19 if we have been able to change your status.

Sincerely yours,

Sidney M. Rosen

Sidney M. Rosen
Program Director

SMR:at
Enclosures

1395 Lower Campus Road · Honolulu, Hawaii 96822 / Cable Address: UNIHAW

Jeanne

Participants in Training Program for Community College Teachers

July 31, 1970

Aiona, Darrow L. - Manpower Development - 2563 Date Street, Apt.301, Honolulu
Phone - 946-3551
Anderson, Gretchen - Art - 1550 Wilder Ave. Apt.B-205, Honolulu. Tel.941-4516
AuHoy, George - Hotel & Restaurant Training
99-712 Poko Road, Aiea, Hawaii. Tel. 4882877
Baltis, Paul - Language Lab. Supervisor
95-568 Kaamee St. Mililani Town, Hawaii. Tel. 623-3539
Brinson, Louise - Humanities
Diamond Head Hotel
Perm. Address - 1603 - 31st St. Meridian Mississippi 39301
Chu, Donald, - Data Processing
550 Poipu Drive, Honulu, 96821 Tel. 395-2414
Field, Douglas - Language
Royal Manor 2908 - 2259 Kalakaua Ave. Honolulu
Perm. Address - 210 Awapuhi St. Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii 96815
Giel, Douglas - Business Adm.
406 Hao St. Aina Haina, Hawaii 96821
Harrell, O.V. - Coordinator - College Ed. Adv. Project
Sky Lane Inn, Honolulu
Perm. Address - 1651 S. Palmetto St. S. Daytona, Florida 32019
Harrell, Lorene - Reading
Sky Lane Inn, Honolulu
1651 S. Palmetto St. S. Daytona, Florida 30219
Harris, Mrs. Holly - Couselor
95-306 Auhaele Place, Mililani Town, Hi. 96822 Tel. 623-3349
Hayasaki, Sinikka - Japanese, Linguistics
1724 Mikahala Way, Honolulu, Hawaii 96816.Tel. 732-1356
Hobbs, William - Psychology
2025A Pacific Heights Road, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 Tel. 531-8467
Hock, Jerome - Applied Arts
2908 Robert Place, Honolulu, Hi 96816 Tel. 732 2005
Ikeda, Tsutomu - Business/Education
1356 Mamalu St. Honlulu
Perm. Address - 72 Kumukoa St. Hilo, Hi 96720 Tel. 935-0553
Kalani, Henry - Director food service and hospitality
2815 Booth Road, Honolulu, Hi. 96815
Kawasaki, Margaret - Business
1321 Ahiahi St., Honlulu, Hi 96817 Tel. 845-6795
Kim, Charles - Welding Shop
98-1219 Neki St. Aiea, Honolulu, Hi 96701 Tel. 488-5439
Kisheba, Edward - Business
850 Lokahi St., Honolulu
Perm. Address - 3198 Alohi St. Lihue, Hawaii 96766 Tel. 245-2742
Martinez, Pat - Cosmetology
2957 Kalakaua Ave. Honolulu, Hawaii 96715 Tel. 923-5286
Mitchell, Edna - Education / Social Science

Perm. Address - 1268 Mertens Dr. San Luis Obispo, Ca. 93401 Tl. 816-781-5785
Morioka, June - Medical Assisting Instructor
37 California Ave. Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii 96786 Tel 621-7080

Nakamura, Irene - Math.
3330 Monsarrat Ave. Honolulu, Hi. 96815 Tel 737-9675
Ng, Paul - Economics & Business Law
2352 Akalakala St. Pearl City, Hawaii 96782 Tel 455 -1855
Nowicki, Henry - Geography
1319 Maalahi St. Honolulu, Hi 96819 Tel. 839-5275
Nunes, Haroldine - English
1561 Kanunu St. Apt. 1201, Honolulu, Hi. 96814 Tel. 959-2113
Opoka, Jane - Speech Communication
926 Punaliiō St. Honolulu, Hi. 96822 Tel. 537-3560
Peterson, Barbara - Social Studies
3045 Pualei Circle #308, Honolulu, Hi. Tel. 923-9404
Rich, Joseph - Speech/English
2640 Dole St. #2C Honolulu, Hi.
Perm. Address - 650 Crister Ave. Chico, Cal. 95926 Tel. 916-342-7459
Roberts, Norman - English
2273 Apoēpoe St. Pearl City, Hi. 96782 Tel. 455-2631
Ross. Sandra - Reading
2947 Kaiakaua, Honolulu 96815 Tel. 922-1928
Perm. Address 3405 Hilltop Road, Fort Worth, Texas 76109
Schroeder, Emma - Reading

410 MOckingbird Lane, Wharton, Texas 77488 Tel. 713-532-5582
Tani, Carolyn - Curriculum Planning
45-329 Mealele St. Kaneohe, Hi 96744 Tel. 808-247-0317
Tani, Molly - English
1958 - A Vancouver Drive, Honolulu, Hi 96822 Tel. 946-8116
Torres, Lawrence - Electronics
1702 Kewalo St. Apt 1106, Honolulu, Hi. 96822 Tel. 533-1604
Tsunoda, Joyce - Chemistry
1814 Koolehua St. Pearl City, Hi. 96782 Tel. 455-7771
Wong, Grace - English
2020 Vancouver Drive, Honolulu, Hi. 96822 Tel. 808-949-2716
Xigogianis, Louis - English
3810 Leahi Ave. Apt.210, Honolulu, Hi. 96815 Tel. 923-6764

Deprivation and Its Effect on Learning

Course Outline

S.M. Rosen
H. McAlexsus

I. Understanding the Problem
   A. Expectations that trainees have for the training program
   B. Exploration of experiences which trainees have had with deprived students
   C. A beginning look at the characteristics that are identified as the values and behaviors of the poor (This will only be touched on here in order to prepare for the first field trip. A more detailed study will be undertaken at a later date).

Readings:
Frost/Hawkes, The Disadvantaged Child, Articles 1,5 6,29,47,48,49,53.
Riessman & Jencks, The Academic Revolution Chapter XI.
Sibbett, W.E., ed., How and Why Do We Learn? Article by Stephen Wiseman, "Learning versus Teaching," pp. 15 41.
Fantini, Mario D. & Weinstein, Gerald, The Disadvantaged: Challenge to Education.

II. Trip to Waialua Sugar Co. Plantation and Mill to observe living and working conditions and to become better acquainted with the educationally oriented values of economically marginal agricultural workers and their children.

III. The nature of poverty and poverty class values and behaviors.
Discussion will include:
   1. How it feels to be poor
   2. What society-as-a-whole looks like to the poor
   3. The meaning of "the sub-culture of poverty"

Assignments: Prepare comparisons between the poverty class value system and the middle class and upper class value systems for class discussion.

Readings:
Moynihan, Daniel P., ed., On Understanding Poverty
The following Articles:
   Miller & Roby, "Poverty: Changing Social Stratification" pp. 64-84.
   Lewis, "The Culture of Poverty," pp. 187-200.
   Rainwater, "The Problem of Lower-Class Culture and Poverty-War Strategy", pp. 229-259.
Gladwin, Thomas, Poverty U.S.A. Chapter 6 "Poverty Is Being Incompetent", pp. 112-150.
Ferman, Louis, et.al., Poverty in America Chap. 5, "The Values of the Poor", pp. 259-311.
   Chap. 6, "The Life of the Poor", pp. 312-339 (especially pp. 353-370).
Seligman, Ben B., Permanent Poverty, Chap 5, pp. 83-107.
Seligman, Ben B., ed., Aspects of Poverty, Article by Lerner, "Crisis in the Schools" pp. 129-161.
Riessman & Jencks, Chap III. Educational Mobility Human Deviance: Social Problems and Social Control. Chap. 3, "The Concept of Secondary Deviation".

IV. Discussion of differences in class value systems and an exploration of the question "Are there, in addition to a poverty sub-culture, middle class and upper class sub-cultures that influence communication that take place across sub-cultural lines?

Readings:
Riessman, Frank, Strategies Against Poverty,
Chapter V "The Strategy of Style" pp. 47-54.
Chapter VI "Digging the Man's Language" pp. 55-61.
Theobald, Robert, ed., Social Policies for America in the Seventies,
Article by John Holt "Education for the Future" pp. 187-188.

V. Field visit to the Kalihi-Palama Model Cities Area. An automobile and walking tour will be conducted during which trainees will have the opportunity to engage in dialogue with residents.

VI. The educational process and the factors that enhance and retard learning for the deprived student. Discussion will include an analysis of the educational structure and attitudes (particularly in community colleges) that do and do not contribute to the education of the poor. Trainees will also explore variations in the process of education that can enhance the community college structure.

Readings:
Moore, William Jr., Against the Odds,
Chap. 1 "The Dilemma"
Chap. 6 "The Curriculum"
Pantini & Weinstein, The American School: A Sociological Analysis,
Chap. 5 "Stratification: Classrooms in a Class Society".

Deprivation and Its Effect on Learning

Supplemental Reading List

Keyserling, Leon H., Progress or Poverty: The U.S. at the Crossroads, Conference on Economic Progress, Washington, D.C., 1964

de Grazio, Alfred and Sohn, David A., Revolution in Teaching, Bantam Matrix, New York, 1964

Dialogue on Poverty, The Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc., 1967

Davis, Kenneth S., The Paradox of Poverty in America, The H.W. Wilson Co., New York, 1969

A Handbook for Teaching in the Ghetto Schools - T. Rukowitz

Dark Ghetto - Clark

A History of Education in America - Pullian

Coming of Age in America - Friedenberg

The Way it Spozed to Be - Heidon

Death at an Early Age - Kozol

Teaching Strategies for the Culturally Disadvantaged - Toba & Elkins

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

Department of Psychology

July 27 - August 14, 1970

# Training Program for Community College Educators of Academically Deprived College Students

S.W. 630

Scott MacDonald and Gilfred Tanabe

The Course is structured in three segments; (1) Introduction to general principles of learning and supporting rationale, (2) Application of learning principles in the community college classroom setting, and (3) Techniques of evaluating student performance. Segment one will be relatively brief and the course emphasis will be on segments two and three.

Segment 1. Introduction to general learning principles and supporting rationale.

a. The conceptualization of behavior from a learning point of view
b. Learning principles and their supporting rationale
c. Extension of these principles in various settings

Segment 2. Application of learning principles in the community college classroom.

a. Classroom assessment techniques for establishing level of student competence.
b. Classroom management techniques in regard to academic and non-academic behavior
c. Motivational schemes of minority group students
d. Programs of intervention; the use of group and individual intervention techniques in regard to student academic performance
e. The use of broad spectrum techniques in regard to student academic and nonacademic performance; e.g., group counseling, structured study hall, etc.

Segment 3. Techniques of evaluating student performance

a. Use of built-in assessment procedures
b. Assessing group and individual programs of intervention
c. Assessing broad spectrum techniques

Learning and Teaching Theory

Reading List

W.S. MacDonald
G. Tanabe

Ronald Gallimore and Alan Howard (eds.) Studies in a Hawaiian Community: Na Makamaka O Nanakuli P.A.R. No. 1 Bernice P. Bishop Museum, 1968. Honolulu.

A Teachers' Guide To Behavior Modification. Human Interaction Research Institute.

Sloggett, Barbara. Individual and Group Reinforcement in Low Achieving Hawaiian Students. M.A. Thesis, University of Hawaii, Department of Psychology, 1968.

MacDonald, Scott. Public Education in Rural Hawaii: a Multi-Million Dollar Misunderstanding. Bernice P. Bishop Museum. In Press.

MacDonald, Scott, Gallimore, Ronald and MacDonald, Gwen. Contingency Counseling by School Personnel: an economical model of intervention. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis. In press.

Boggs, Steven. The Meaning of Questions and Narratives. In press.

MacDonald, Scott & Tanabe, Gilbert.(Eds) Where the Action is: Research in Public School Classrooms. Psychology Department, University of Hawaii. In Press.

Phillips, E.L., Achievement Place: Token Reinforcement Procedures in a Home Style Rehabilitation Setting for "Pre-delinquent" Boys. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis. 1 (3), Fall 1968, 213-223.

Meacham, M.L. and Wiesen, A.E. Changing Classroom Behavior: a manual for precision teaching. Scranton: International Textbook Co., 1969.

Text: Mager, Robert F. Developing Attitude toward Learning, Fearon, Palo Alto, California, 1968.

Training Program for Community College

Educators of Academically Deprived

College Students

S.W. 630

Three Week Training Program Schedule--July 27-August 14, 1970

First Week and Second Week

Classes at Honolulu Community College on Monday and Tuesday and Thursday and Friday. Wednesday will be used for field trips.

On July 29, we will visit an area of rural poverty on the North Shore of Oahu. Oh August 5 we will explore urban poverty in the Kalihi-Palama area.

Third Week

Monday through Thursday will be spent in a teaching laboratory where students and fellow trainees will observe your teaching skills and help you to evaluate your teaching effectiveness. Friday, which will be the last day of the training program, will be spent in evaluating the program.

EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY
COLLEGE EDUCATORS OF ACADEMICALLY DEPRIVED STUDENTS

Grant #70-2829

CONTENTS
(In Order of Presentation)


I. Director's Evaluation

II. Research Evaluation conducted by Dr. Bernice Polemis

III. Questionnaires used in Research Evaluation

IV. Program Announcement (originally mimeographed on blue stock - photocopied for inclusion because supply has been exhausted). Announcement was done in this fashion due to the time factor. By the time we received notification of our grant approval it was time to have announcements sent out and therefore no time to have a printed brochure made.

V. Letter sent to community college provosts notifying them of the program. Announcements for distribution to faculty were included with the letter. Announcements of the program were also included in the Community College bulletin.

VI. Letter sent to applicants.

VII. Letter and form requesting applicant information sent to applicants.

VIII. Letter of acceptance sent to successful applicants.

IX. Return form from successful applicants.

X. Letter sent to alternate candidates.

XI. Return form from alternate candidates

XII. Letter notifying trainees of time and location for program.

XIII. Roster of trainees.

XIV. Course outline and bibliography for the program component on "Deprivation and Its Effect on Learning."

XV. Course outline and bibliography for the program component on "Learning and Teaching Theory."

XVI. Overall program outline and schedules.

XVII. Kalihi-Palama community description prepared by the Kalihi-Palama Model City Association.

Training Program for Community College

Educators of Academically Deprived

College Students

S.W. 630

Daily Schedule
(at Honolulu Community College)

| | |
|---|---|
| 9:00 - 10:00 | Class (Sec. 1 in Room 1)<br>(Sec. 2 in Room 102) |
| 10:00 - 10:15 | Coffee Break |
| 10:15 - 11:30 | Class resumes |
| 11:30 - 1:30 | Study and Lunch |
| 1:30 - 2:30 | Class (Sec. 2 in Room 1)<br>(Sec. 1 in Room 102) |
| 2:30 - 2:45 | Coffee Break |
| 2:45 - 4:00 | Class resumes |

---

Instructors:

Sec. 1. Scott MacDonald and Gil Tanabe
Learning and teaching theory

Sec. 2. Sid Rosen and Michael McAleenan
Deprivation and its affect on learning

Training Program for Community College

Educators of Academically Deprived

College Students

S.W. 630

Schedule for Third Week

Teaching Laboratory

| | |
|---|---|
| 9:00 - 10:15 | Teaching (Room 102 and 103) |
| 10:15 - 10:30 | Coffee Break |
| 10:30 - Noon | Evaluation |
| Noon - 1:00 | Lunch |
| 1:00 - 2:15 | Teaching (Room 102 and 103) |
| 2:15 - 2:30 | Coffee Break |
| 2:30 - 4:00 | Evaluation |

KALIHI-PALAMA MODEL CITY ASSOCIATION
333 NORTH KING STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII, 96817
TELEPHONE: 537-5643 538-6511

# NEIGHBORHOOD AND HOME ENVIRONMENTS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS FROM THE KALIHI-PALAMA MODEL CITIES AREA, HONOLULU, HAWAII

July 28, 1970

## NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT

The Kalihi-Palama Model Neighborhood Area (MNA) is an old, crowded, long-neglected and socially and economically deprived section of Honolulu located adjacent to the central business district of the city.

Through many long years, the public services provided the area have been minimal.

There are many narrow streets, some of them mere lanes, that were laid out in horse and buggy days. These are not adequate for local traffic, and are clogged where through traffic must be accommodated. The area is crossed by major traffic arteries, including a freeway, with attendant noise and disruption.

Many streets in the Kalihi-Palama MNA have no sidewalks, curbs, or gutters. Street lighting is poor in most areas.

Sewer systems are antiquated and inadequate, causing pollution of streams and drainage canals. Noxious industries dump raw wastes into the canals, create unpleasant odors and dust clouds.

A heavy concentration of crowded and noisy public housing and urban renewal bulldozing has been imposed upon the Kalihi-Palama MNA. This has caused community disruption and social conflict.

Most of the private dwellings are in various stages of disrepair, some being delapidated beyond rehabilitation. The natural ravages of time are responsible for much of this; many homes being 40 or more years old. Most property owners do not live in the area, and have failed to maintain their rented holdings. The traditional poverty of the area has made it financially impossible for many residents who own the homes in which they live to maintain their property.

Ill-conceived city zoning regulations prevent many homeowners from either rehabilitating or replacing their delapidated homes.

Both low-rise and high-rise apartments have been permitted to replace areas of one-family homes in the Kalihi-Palama MNA. This has added to the crowded conditions and the traffic problems.

Residents are forced to tolerate both noise and hazard from jet aircraft taking off from the nearby Honolulu International Airport.

There is a serious lack of parks and recreational open spaces in the Kalihi-Palama MNA. Those that do exist are not wide enough in range for use to accommodate the needs of all segments of the residents. Many children must play on sidewalks and streets. Many teenagers and adults have no choice but to lounge on street corners or in run down poolrooms. Many of the elderly can only loll in the sunshine in front of badly deteriorated commercial-dwelling buildings that abound in the area.

Public planning in Honolulu has paid scant attention to the urban needs of the Kalihi-Palama MNA, much less to the desires of property owners and tenants. Because of the central location of the area, land values are high. This has led to poorly controlled speculation in land development. Planning agencies have tended to deal in gross considerations of land uses, traffic and people. The agencies know little and have shown small consideration about either the overall or personal impacts of planning decisions.

Land use planning has tended to follow the dictates of the market, leaning toward higher densities and apartments in opposition to residents preference for keeping the area predominantly in single-family use.

In general, public planning is centralized, professionalized, and highly bureaucratic. Local communication is limited to formal hearings and individual petitions. Citizen participation in planning procedures is discouraged to the point of denial.

It was not until the advent of the Model Cities Program that residents and property owners of the Kalihi-Palama MNA were offered opportunity for taking part in the upgrading of their community and their standard of living.

In general, residents of the Kalihi-Palama MNA enjoy less physical well being than those of other Honolulu areas. Tooth decay and other dental health problems abound. These conditions exist primarily because of the poverty traditional in the area.

Unemployment and underemployment, and the resulting low incomes, are basic problems facing many residents of the Kalihi-Palama MNA. While centrally located, the area has not shared the economic development of urban Honolulu generally.

Low income levels are due partially to the fact that many residents do not have the necessary education and training to advance to higher paying employment. A contributing factor is the heavy

reliance of the economy of the area upon industries (such as pine-apple canneries) which provide a large number of jobs with no opportunities for socio-economic advancement.

The Kalihi-Palama MNA has many long-term unemployed, the unskilled, the elderly and welfare recipients. There are many who are not in the work force because they have been discouraged or have lost the desire to work. Many youths have dropped out of school and are poorly educated - becoming the untrained and the marginally employed or unemployed. Among those in school, many are not counseled in work opportunities, and are not prepared to seek worthwhile employment when they leave or graduate from school.

Very little is known about how residents of the Kalihi-Palama MNA define the community in which they live - what their concept of community is. The fact that 77 percent of the residents are tenants rather than property owners tends to keep low an interest in the area betterment. It is difficult to motivate residents to attend Model Cities Census Tract Committee meetings - the basic Model Cities resident participation organization.

It is obvious that the environment of the Kalihi-Palama MNA is not conducive to a high interest in education among the youth of the area.

HOME ENVIRONMENT

By far the majority of young people from the Kalihi-Palama MNA entering a community college will live in public housing or more or less delapidated private homes - either home most likely being crowded and noisy. Rarely will a student from the area have at home a place of seclusion and quiet for study.

However, even the most run down of homes in the are are kept clean. Personal cleanliness is a matter of habit with the vast majority of residents.

Many students will live in homes where English is not spoken, or at best a form of pidgin. This makes it difficult for these students to habitually speak the proper English they are taught in class.

Many of the parents in the Kalihi-Palama MNA greatly value education, encourage their children to attend school, and consider a high school diploma or attendance at an institution of higher learning an important goal.

However, many students from the area come from families in which a high school education is a recently developed opportunity, and a college education an unrealistic goal.

Parents in the area generally have little experience with education either directly or indirectly, although they do associate a better education with a better job and a better way of life.

Parents almost unanimously stress to their children the importance of education, often using their own cases as negative examples. Though the parents can generalize upon the importance of education to their children, they cannot explain specifically how effort expended in school or the mastery of particular subjects is related to future benefits. Therefore, they cannot act effectively as a deterrent when their children lack a deep interest in going to school or college, or display only a cursory interest in studying at home.

Parents in the Kalihi-Palama MNA love their children, and often this affection leads to a permissiveness that does not afford parental discipline conducive to a thorough application to educational study.

A goodly number of students from the area come from broken homes, where effective parental discipline is most lax.

The neighborhood and home environments given briefly here makes it obvious that community college students from the Kalihi-Palama MNA have practically no community or home experience with which they may accommodate themselves to an academic atmosphere. They are handicapped in orienting themselves to the world of education and acquiring proper study habits.

It is equally obvious that these students need from their instructors exceptional efforts at understanding, effective guidance, and perhaps teaching methods that are out of the ordinary.